PARTS OF THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

ARE OF POOR REPRODUCTIVE QUALITY

CERTAINES PARTIES DU DOCUMENT ORIGINAL

SONT DE PIÈTRE QUALITÉ DE REPRODUCTION

Evaluation Report Of The Gifted and Talented Program Camrose School District #1315

Warren D. Wilde
Melvin T. Sillito

Alberta Education

Alberta

87-03378/

EVALUATION REPORT

OF THE

GIFTED AND TALENTED PROGRAM

CAMROSE SCHOOL DISTRICT #1315

Warren D. Wilde

Melvin T. Sillito

Prepared Under Contract to Alberta Education

October 1986

ABSTRACT

Evaluation Report of the Gifted and Talented Program, Camrose School District #1315, Wilde, Warren D. and Sillito, Melvin T., April 1985, (19 pp. + app.).

The report is one of a triad of formative evaluations in each of three school systems of dissimilar size in Alberta. The three, Camrose School District #1315, Strathcona County #20, and Calgary Board of Education, formed a consortium and jointly with Alberta Education sponsored a project to develop and test promising evaluation procedures of programs for gifted students as well as gather information about evaluating gifted children. The consortium provided the venue for field tryout plus other assistance and Alberta Education provided financial support supplemented with expert advice.

The Camrose Gifted and Talented Program (smallest of the three) consists of pull-out programs in four schools in grade levels four to eight. About 50 students are enrolled in the program under the direction of four teachers. The evaluation report includes historical origins, a description of the current program compiled from information received during interviews with principals, teachers, students and parents, and from questionnaires sent to selected members of these groups, and concludes with recommendations for the school system.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I Introduction.....1

II History.....2

III Program Description by School.....3

IV Information from Planning Documents and Interviews with Principals, Teachers and Children.....6

V Information from Teacher Questionnaires.....11

VI Information from Parent Questionnaires.....13

VII Summary.....15

VIII Recommendations.....17

IX Appendix A.....20

I INTRODUCTION

This evaluation was begun as a part of a project to determine the similarities and differences which exist in programs for gifted children at varied stages of development among three dissimilarly sized school districts in the province of Alberta. The three districts involved in the study are Camrose School District #1315, County of Strathcona #20 and Calgary Board of Education. As a result of this study suggestions will be forthcoming about program development and evaluation.

Information in this report was gathered from documents in the school district and from interviews with several participants. There were numerous interviews with the Associate Superintendent in charge of the program, who provided the organizational framework and school contacts. During one of their sharing meetings, teachers provided the project personnel with information about the program. Later these teachers were interviewed individually by one of the project team as was the principal in each participating school, a sample of students currently enrolled in the program, and a few students who elected to withdraw. Teachers from the system were asked to fill out a questionnaire about the program for gifted/talented children and another questionnaire was sent to parents of all children who had been enrolled in the program. This report is an analysis of the data received.

II HISTORY

The Camrose School District #1315 has 2022 students and 120 teachers in a k-12 system. While there are a variety of programs to meet special needs of learners, the program for gifted and talented students began in 1977 at the same time as a special curriculum for the Education of Mentally Handicapped children was introduced. In 1981 the Board of Trustees established a policy supporting "...the institution and maintenance of special education programming and instruction for students with special needs and abilities, commensurate with the resources available to the school district".

The program began in one school for grades two to six with a one-half day pull-out per week. The students were selected according to their superior achievement (130 I.Q.) on the WISC-R but some dissension resulted when a few students whom teachers expected to be included were not accepted. With the adoption of the Board Policy in 1981 came the regulation that parents must provide written consent before the child would be placed in the program and that the services would be expanded to include children from grades three to eight who met the eligibility criteria. The program has since expanded into four schools but unfortunately the program in one school was closed during the current year.

III PROGRAM DESCRIPTION BY SCHOOL

School Number One

This is a new school and the teacher is new to the program. Nine students began the program this year, but one dropped out leaving four boys and four girls in a two hour pull-out (students are pulled out of their regular activities) class per week. Among the aims and objectives were creative problem solving, decision making, planning, communication and the cognitive skills of analysis, synthesis, evaluation and flexibility. The students engaged in such activities as learning sign language for the deaf, learning about photography, exploring the Space Sciences Centre, exchanging roles with a teacher, and "brain teasers" or puzzles for the mind. Students were instructed as a group both in class and on field trips, given assistance individually, and helped to study a topic independently.

School Number Two

At this school thirteen students (six boys and seven girls) from grade levels four through eight are taught in two separate pull-out classes. Grades four and five receive one hour of class time in addition to some special events and grades six through eight receive two hours of class instruction as well as some special activities on a few evenings and on Saturday.

The activities for both groups included a variety of individual and group projects. The students produced a television news show, taking on all responsibilities such as reporting, hosting, and filming, as well as the technical details of production. They also produced a television quiz show for grade six students in the Camrose area called "Hi Q" in which the class designed the format of the show and developed the questions. The class was involved in a space science unit and visited the Space Sciences Centre in Edmonton. There were individual projects including interviewing and filming individuals and groups, such as a policeman, school assemblies, a concert, etc. In the spring students intend to learn about navigation and how to fly an airplane. The learning emphasis throughout has been on creative thinking, effective communication, planning, decision-making, analysis, synthesis, evaluation, and flexibility of thinking in problem solving.

School Number Three

Nineteen children (thirteen boys and six girls) are involved in a program for gifted children. There are three groups with seven students at the grade three level, five from grades five and six, and seven from grades seven and eight. All students are in a pull-out arrangement in which grade three students have a one hour class each week , grades five and six receive a minimum of two hours per week and finally the last group receives one and one-half hours per week after school plus additional activities.

There was a variety of activities for the children in this program which were intended to achieve creative thinking, creative problem solving, analysis, synthesis, evaluation, planning, decision-making, communicating, originality and elaboration. The students published a newspaper which involved planning the feature articles, gathering information, writing, taking pictures, constructing puzzles and creating contests, as well as using the computer for layout and word processing. There were individual study projects using computer soft- ware, games, creating computer programs, writing a book about ancestors, and a radio recording. Group projects included instruction in photography, painting, and a trip to the Space Sciences Centre. The students produced many articles for the newspaper and learned how the computer can be useful in the newspaper industry and other writing endeavors, as well as the need to persist on a project even though it is time consuming and sometimes tiring because of the routine.

School Number Four

Three boys and one girl from grades five and six are taught in a pull-out arrangement for two hours per week. Unfortunately six students dropped out of the program in this school.

The program focused on individual projects and independent study for the most part with only one major group activity, a trip to the Space Sciences Centre. The intended student outcomes are creative thinking and creative problem solving, analysis, synthesis, evaluation, planning, decision-making, communicating, creativity and elaboration. Students in the program have been involved in studying and developing murder mysteries, completing problem worksheets called "mind-benders", and individual projects such as a study of the accomplishments of Chester Ronning, a study of pyramids complete with a scale model, a study of World War II, taping of a radio play, computer programming and work on pre-

programmed computer software. While some students expressed satisfaction with the program and with being identified with it, there was general dissatisfaction because it interfered with more interesting individual projects and required catching up on missed school work.

IV INFORMATION FROM PLANNING DOCUMENTS, INTERVIEWS WITH PARTICIPATING PRINCIPALS, TEACHERS OF THE GIFTED, AND CHILDREN IN THE PROGRAM

Teacher Selection

Little is said in the planning documents regarding teacher selection. In practice it appears that teachers who express an interest are given first consideration but the final selection is a decision of the Associate Superintendent and the principal based on a number of criteria including interest, teaching performance and availability.

Student Identification

In September of 1981 Camrose School District #1315 adopted procedures to assist students with special needs and abilities which included the identification of the academically talented. It was expected that a screening of the total population for grades three to eight would take place to identify the top 15%, from which three to six percent would be selected to participate in the program. After the initial program had been initiated, similar procedures of screening were to take place during the fall of each year with the grade three students. The students selected from the grade three pool were expected to begin the program the following year.

It was intended that students be evaluated on the following five criteria which would have equal weight, (Appendix A).

1. Group tests including a group I.Q. test, Canadian Test of Basic Skills, and achievement on the previous year's work.

2. Evaluation by the teacher, on a four point scale, regarding the child's learning characteristics, motivational characteristics, creativity, and leadership characteristics.

3. Student self-evaluation where the child rated him/herself on 24 statements which research has shown are indicative of gifted behavior. A four point scale (strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree), was used with the final question asking the child to state in which of six areas he/she seemed to have the most talent.

4. A parent inventory with both open-ended questions and a four point rating scale for some items intended to determine the extent to which the parent felt the child differed from the average child in behavior.

5. Results of an individual intelligence test (WISC-R) submitted by the district psychologist.

The above criteria were to be applied to the top 15% of the class selected from the results of standardized test scores, previous year's work and a rating of each child on intelligence, creativity, self-concept, athletic ability, artistic ability, verbal ability, problem solving ability, leadership ability, reading ability, mathematical ability, general knowledge, motivation to learn, personality, popularity, initiative, awareness of others, and science aptitude.

The results were expected to be collected by the classroom teacher and forwarded to the teacher of the program for Gifted and Talented. No mention is made in the guidelines as to who would be responsible for the final selection, whether this was to be the teacher only or to be decided by a selection committee. The parents of students selected were notified and a consent form filed in the Student's Cumulative Record Folder.

Information from interviews with the principal and teachers in each of the schools showed some interesting differences between the practices and intents of the district respecting identification of children for the program. There is some uncertainty about who nominates the child, what evaluation instruments should be given and who makes the final selection decision. While the procedure of identification is inconsistent when viewed from a system perspective, the teachers tend to believe that all children suited for the program are given an opportunity to be accepted. Some children do not meet the criteria for acceptance but were included because of the benefit they will derive. Information is distributed to parents by mail and by word-of-mouth and parent evaluation and consent forms are returned by the children. In one school there was a meeting called for parents to discuss the program. The final selection is usually made by the teacher of the gifted using an accumulation of test scores and information from other sources. Only in one school was the principal involved in the selection. Communication and supervision of the intended procedures is necessary among the various constituents if a standardized procedure of identification is to be achieved.

Curriculum

From the documents studied, it appears that there is no prescribed curriculum for the gifted. It is expected that teachers will develop curricular goals and make available opportunities for experiences that meet the needs of each gifted child in the program. The objectives and expected outcomes refer to affective development and development of cognitive skills but these are often quite vague. The descriptions of programs for the gifted show that there are several differences and only a few similarities among the schools in the district.

As noted earlier in the program descriptions for each school, it seems that the curriculum focuses on adding new information and experiences rather than expanding on topics already provided in the provincial curriculum guides. The curriculum was planned after consulting with students, parents and other teachers to determine areas of interest and possible resources. While most teaching units were locally developed either within the school or cooperatively among district teachers of the gifted, there were some commercially prepared units utilized. Adding new content has the advantage of avoiding repetition and appealing to individual interests and even creating new interests. It may have the disadvantage of being somewhat superficial for the student whose interests and expertise go beyond what can be accomplished in group projects. There is an opportunity for students to explore topics of individual choice which presumably allows continued study of a topic in greater depth, though this aspect was not mentioned by teachers or students.

There were several benefits of the current curriculum noted by both teachers and students. Teachers believe the students have achieved a greater sense of self-worth and a more positive attitude toward learning as well as providing an added challenge to their school generally. Students generally were proud to be in the program and had developed some intimate friendships through the activities such as the field trip to the Space Sciences Centre in Edmonton, cooperating on the newspaper project, television productions and other group projects.

The negative comments from students focused on what they perceived as lack of planning and organization. A few students found some activities boring because they lost interest, had to complete detailed reports and were given worksheets or homework which was not to their liking. Other students cited conflicts between the program for the gifted and other activities they enjoyed or subjects in

school they did not want to miss. Overall the students were quite supportive of the curricular activities and the main complaints were from those who decided to drop out of the program.

When asked what was the most and least interesting activity or method of instruction, the reaction was varied. It was generally agreed that the trip to the Space Sciences Centre was one of the most exciting events and also that field trips were more interesting than in-school activities. The group which replaced a staff member for a day were enthusiastic. Students did not like worksheets and were rather critical of being required to make up work missed during their absence from the regular class.

Student Evaluation

There seemed to be little if anything communicated to schools by way of policy on evaluating gifted children. As a result each school and specifically each teacher carried out this function as desired, resulting in a lack of consistency. In essence there is no formal structure for evaluation of the gifted so that some students receive verbal feedback about their work, others receive written feedback in terms of marks and comments on projects, while some receive nothing and a few are asked to perform a self-evaluation of their achievement.

Teachers and principals were asked to express themselves about the need for evaluation and all seemed to feel that it was necessary. They said it provided feedback about the value of the program and whether the goals were being met so that improvements could be made. They further believed that it provided students with a sense of achievement and related to educational standards. One principal said that evaluation should provide feedback to parents of the children involved and to the district generally to show an accountability for the time and funds expended.

Program Evaluation

There does not seem to be any statement, policy or set of procedures in place to evaluate programs for gifted children. This was considered to be an important area by all principals and teachers if improvements were to be made and if the program was to be justified to all constituents.

Teacher In-service

No official statement or policy was found in the planning documents for the gifted/talented program with respect to in-service activity. In practice there has been guidance from the Associate Superintendent and provision for meetings of the teachers to share ideas and plan some common activities. In addition most teachers were sponsored to attend conferences and workshops. One teacher had attended more than twenty such sessions over several years (not all while employed at Camrose) enabling him to gain considerable knowledge about different approaches to teaching gifted children, which had resulted in the development of a personal philosophy about educating these children.

The lack of in-service for teachers of the gifted and the school principals was of concern to most of those interviewed. Teachers generally agreed that the depth of in-service was inadequate and, while they had received an overview, there were many topics including evaluation which were never addressed. Principals were generally of the opinion that in-service was, for all practical purposes, non-existent.

V INFORMATION FROM TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRES

Teachers in the district, other than those in the gifted and talented program, were sent questionnaires to determine their knowledge and involvement with the program for gifted children. There were 32 responses.

Identification

Of the 32 teachers who returned the questionnaires, only one-third had been involved in the identification process. These teachers had helped by administering tests, filling out inventories and making recommendations. In total there were 33 children (16 boys and 17 girls) identified from the classrooms of the respondents.

Less than half (13) of the teachers found the procedures acceptable but 14 did not respond because they were unaware of the procedures. The majority of those involved found the process useful and of help in further understanding the gifted child. These teachers also were of the opinion that the process was appropriate, well timed and not overly demanding of their time or energy. Of interest is the fact that while slightly over half of the responses indicated that students were correctly identified, four teachers believed that some students were not properly classified.

Comments about the identification process revealed some dissatisfaction. It seems that teachers would like more information about student identification and the program in general. One teacher questioned whether I.Q. alone is sufficient to place a child in the program. Another comment questioned the practice of allowing students into the program who were doing poorly in class, while not providing an opportunity for highly motivated students who were achieving at the top of the class. Generally the teachers who were knowledgeable of the identification procedures were supportive.

Curriculum

In order to determine the dispersion of knowledge about the gifted/talented curriculum, teachers were asked a number of questions. Twenty-two of the 32 respondents had children from their classrooms in the program, but only six said they were familiar with the curriculum. Of these six, only two had received information from a teacher, while the remaining four knew of the program only through students' reports.

Six of nine teachers who reported that students missed their classes to attend the special program believed it provides at least as much value as the regular program. Those teachers supporting the program noted that students usually knew most of the regular work anyway, however one teacher did draw attention to the fact that one child consistently missed Physical Education which was not a part of the curriculum for gifted children.

In-service

Teachers were asked about their knowledge of the program gained through in-service. Only four of the 32 respondents said they had received in-service instruction and they were of the opinion that the treatment of topics such as identification, special needs of gifted children and the curriculum were inadequately addressed.

Selected Comments

There were not a lot of comments from teachers with respect to the program. Some gave support and felt it was necessary to provide challenges for these students. There were a few less supportive of the philosophy who felt that while something extra or different should be done, it was not in the best interests of a school to give special trips to the gifted as rewards when others could benefit from such experiences. This comment takes on added significance when it is realized that some teachers were of the opinion that a few students were not allowed entry to the program who should have been and others were admitted who did not deserve it.

VI INFORMATION FROM PARENT QUESTIONNAIRES

Identification

Parents were asked how they received information about the program for gifted children as well as whether they had filled out the required parent inventory that was part of the identification procedure. The responses were varied.

Mostly the parents learned of the program through their children or from information delivered to them from the school via their child, but some had inquired about special programs or had heard about the program from other parents or teachers. Most parents were satisfied with the information provided by the school except for the two responses received from School Number Two which indicated there had been little communication. While almost all parents had completed the parent inventory and found it adequate to serve the intended purpose, there was one parent who felt it did not adequately describe the characteristics of her child.

Curriculum

Parents were asked about their involvement in the curriculum development process. While a few had offered suggestions about the curriculum content, most had not been asked to provide input and none felt they had been instrumental in the decisions of the curriculum. Only one parent had been involved in the implementation and this was through teaching some children about pettipoint embroidery. In response to the question of whether the curriculum was adequate, half said yes and half said no, but comments were not provided.

Student Outcomes

Parents were asked if their children were more motivated about school and had a greater variety of interests because of the program for gifted/talented. The response was a guarded yes because while the children seemed to enjoy school, most parents felt their children had always enjoyed school and were not sure that the enthusiasm could be attributed to the special program only. Almost all parents believed their children had a broader range of interests and more self-confidence because of the program however.

Since some children selected to receive special attention in programs designated for gifted children encounter ostracism,

parents were asked to comment on this aspect. Most children seemed to be treated well by their peers but there was the feeling that some teachers not involved in the program resented children leaving their classroom and made disparaging comments or forced the children to do extra work. The action of these teachers has been interpreted by children and parents as a lack of endorsement.

There was nearly unanimous support for the program by those parents who responded because of the enthusiasm of the children but there were some worthwhile suggestions. Parents would like to have more direct feedback from teachers on the progress of their children and what they are accomplishing. While the children report to the parents regularly, the lack of communication with the teacher was noted. It was further suggested that there be more obvious cooperation for the program from the total teaching staff. Parents would also like an opportunity to meet with the principal at the beginning of each school year to discuss the program. A final suggestion was that the I.Q. score be less prominent in the selection process.

VII SUMMARY

The Camrose School District #1315 began a program for gifted and talented students in 1977, and has expanded the program from one school with a half-day pull-out to four schools with a variety of delivery modes. It was expected that students in grade three would be screened by each classroom teacher based on standardized test scores, classroom achievement, and on a number of personal attributes. The top 15% of the students so rated would then form a pool to be further evaluated, based on the results of an individually administered I.Q. test, student self-evaluation, and parent inventory. From the pool of possible candidates a number equaling three to six percent of the district school population would be selected for special attention in the gifted and talented program. The program guidelines did not prescribe a specific curriculum but referred to development of the affective and cognitive domains as expected outcomes. While no specific statement was made on in-service there has been provision for release-time meetings and opportunities to attend workshops and conferences sponsored by other school jurisdictions.

The current school year began with four schools offering programs for those children identified as gifted and talented. The 45 children in grades 4 - 8 (2.2% of the district school population) has dwindled to 34. The program is organized around pull-out classes and outside regular school hour activities (noon, after school, evening, Saturday), depending on the school and grade level. The curriculum focuses on adding new content rather than expanding on topics in provincial curriculum guides, with a sample of activities being learning sign language for the deaf, establishing a newspaper, producing a locally aired television quiz show, working with the computer and numerous individual projects. These activities were intended to foster such skills as flexibility in problem solving approaches, decision-making, planning, analysis, synthesis, evaluation, and effective communication. There appears to be limited evaluation of how students performed during these activities and no method for evaluating the extent to which the program meets its intended objectives.

Children in the program, their parents and teachers in the district were questioned on their views. It was found that only one-third of the teachers had been involved in the screening of children and less than half knew what the identification procedure entailed. One of the most disconcerting findings was a lack of support for the program among some of the teaching staff. Students liked the field trips

but expressed concern about missing school work when they were expected to make it up or miss some school activities they enjoyed. Parents felt they needed more communication from the schools on the curriculum, expectations of teachers and progress of their children. Generally there was strong support for this program throughout the district with only minor irritations evident.

VIII RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are a result of the information received by the research team through interviews with principals, teachers, students, and parents. While there is general satisfaction with the gifted and talented program, these recommendations, if followed, should enhance the program in the future.

1. Selection of Students

It appears that due to a lack of policy statements, identification within the district is somewhat inconsistent. There is uncertainty as to who nominates children for the program and the criteria that should be used. There also seems to be inconsistent use of the tests and other instruments recommended for identification. There is no mention of who will be responsible for the final selection of candidates, leaving open the opportunity for some misunderstanding, even though it is assumed that the associate superintendent will supervise the process.

Recommendation: That a policy statement be developed and ratified by the school board and distributed to schools detailing the procedure for nominating and selecting candidates for the Gifted and Talented Program.

2. Teacher In-service

Opportunities have been provided for teachers to attend some regionally sponsored conferences and workshops in other school districts, as well as have sharing meetings, but these do not seem adequate to provide the necessary training. Teachers have expressed the need for more help in understanding the nature of giftedness and how to meet the needs of gifted children. Since there is no prescribed curriculum and little knowledge among the teachers about how to provide an appropriate curriculum for the gifted, it is necessary that teachers either receive more extensive training on site or be supported through grants to attend conferences, take courses, and visit other successful programs in operation. There is need to help teachers learn more about organizing and planning programs for gifted and talented children as well as how to evaluate progress.

Recommendation: That more in-service sessions be provided to teachers as well as opportunities and financial assistance to allow teachers to attend national and

international conferences, visit other successful programs and take appropriate university courses.

3. Student Evaluation

The evaluation team was unable to find a policy governing evaluation of students in the Gifted and Talented Program and observed considerable inconsistency in evaluation practices. It was observed that student evaluation ranged from little or nothing in some cases to awarded grades in others. In some cases there is verbal feedback on progress and in a limited number of instances there were written comments on projects. A few students were asked to engage in a process of self-evaluation but the absence of criteria made the activity less than fulfilling. Yet all teachers and principals agreed that evaluation of students is necessary and parents complained that they were given inadequate information about student progress.

Recommendation: That policy and recommended procedure governing evaluation of students in the Gifted and Talented Program be developed and consistently applied throughout the district.

4. Communication

There appears to be a lack of communication about the Gifted and Talented Program throughout the district. Parents in the district complained that they did not receive enough information about the program. Parents of children in the program often commented about the need for more information regarding student activities and progress. Regular classroom teachers noted the lack of information about the program and in some cases admitted a lack of support because they did not understand the intent and organization of the program. It would appear that more support would be forthcoming if there was a better communication network within the school system.

Recommendation: That the school district administration establish a procedure to better communicate (i.e. both to send and to receive) information about the program for Gifted and Talented to all constituents, including all school teachers.

5. Program Evaluation

From the documents and interviews it would seem that no policy or procedure has been established for evaluating the Gifted and Talented Program. While this evaluation may help in making some improvements, there is a need for continuous formative evaluation processes so that further modifications will be made in relation to goals and objectives.

Recommendation: That policy and procedure be established to continually evaluate the Gifted and Talented Program in order to make appropriate modifications.

IX APPENDIX A

GIFTED & TALENTED

PROGRAM SELECTION FOR STUDENTS IN GRADES 3 - 8

Candidates for the Gifted & Talented Education Classes may be nominated any time during the school year. A thorough search for candidates will be conducted during September and October of Grade Three. The forms to be used for the appraisal are available from the teacher of your Gifted & Talented Program in your school.

Evaluations of students will be based on the following criteria with equal weightings.

1. Selection for evaluation by a teacher using group I.Q., CTBS results as well as report cards marks.
2. The written evaluation of the student by the teacher.
3. A self-evaluation by the student.
4. An evaluation by the parent.
5. An individual I.Q. test.

After each part of the evaluation has been completed the forms should be forwarded to the teacher of the program in your school.

INITIAL EVALUATION FORM - GIFTED & TALENTED PROGRAM

CLASS NAME: _____ MONTH _____ DAY ____ YEAR _____

NAME OF ALL STUDENTS IN CLASS	ACHIEVEMENT TEST	GROUP I.Q. TEST	SCORE ON TEACHER'S WHOLE CLASS EVALUATION	TEACHER'S INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION "SCALE FOR RATING BEHAVIORIAL CHARACTERISTICS OF SUPERIOR STUDENTS "	STUDENT SELF-EVALUATION. "A STUDENT LOOKS AT HIMSELF"	PARENT EVALUATION "PARENT INVENTORY"	WISC-R

GENERAL SCREENING QUESTIONNAIRE FOR GIFTED & TALENTED

TEACHER _____ LEVEL _____ DATE _____

	1	2	3
Intelligence			
Creativity			
Positive Self-Concept			
Athletic Ability			
Artistic Ability			
Verbal Ability			
Problem Solving Ability			
Leadership Ability			
Reading Ability			
Math Ability			
Knowledge			
Motivation to Learn			
Personality			
Popularity			
Initiative			
Awareness of Others			
Science Aptitude			

TO BE COMPLETED BY THE TEACHER

Scale for Rating Behavioural Characteristics of Superior Students by Joseph S. Renzulli and Robert K. Hartman.

STUDENT'S NAME: _____ TEACHER'S NAME: _____

Directions - The following characteristics give an indication of the appropriateness of a gifted program for this youngster.

Please circle
1. If you have seldom or never observed this characteristic
2. If you have observed this occasionally
3. If you have observed this to a considerable degree
4. If you observe this characteristic most of the time.

PART 1 - LEARNING CHARACTERISTICS

1. Has a large memory	1	2	3	4
2. Knows much information	1	2	3	4
3. Masters material quickly	1	2	3	4
4. Understands cause and effect	1	2	3	4
5. Generalizes and makes accurate observations	1	2	3	4
6. Reads a great deal	1	2	3	4
7. Is bored with routine tasks	1	2	3	4

PART 2 - MOTIVATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

1. Needs little external help to get started	1	2	3	4
2. Strives toward perfection	1	2	3	4
3. Prefers independent work	1	2	3	4
4. Is interested in adult type problems	1	2	3	4
5. Is aggressive or assertive in respect to his beliefs	1	2	3	4
6. Is concerned with right and wrong or moral judgements	1	2	3	4

PART 3 - CREATIVITY

1. Displays curiosity	1	2	3	4
2. Offers unique solutions	1	2	3	4
3. Often takes risks	1	2	3	4
4. Has a good sense of humour	1	2	3	4
5. Is sensitive to beauty	1	2	3	4
6. Is a nonconformist; accepts disorganization; does not fear being different	1	2	3	4

PART 4 - LEADERSHIP CHARACTERISTICS

1. Can handle responsibility	1	2	3	4
2. Is confident with people of equal age	1	2	3	4
3. Expresses himself well; others understand him	1	2	3	4
4. Is sociable	1	2	3	4
5. Tends to dominate others in activities	1	2	3	4
6. Excels in athletics	1	2	3	4

A STUDENT LOOKS AT HIMSELF

Please show whether you agree or disagree with each of the statements by marking one of the spaces.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. I am a good athlete				
2. I am a good student				
3. I am popular with other students				
4. I am one who understands and accepts other people				
5. I am very sociable and know how to get along with other people				
6. Other people recognize that I am an intelligent person				
7. I am warm and understanding				
8. I am easy to get along with				
9. I enjoy working with mechanical and scientific things				
10. I enjoy abstract or mathematical problems				
11. I am one who likes to work independently on special projects				
12. I enjoy debating or discussing an idea				
13. I enjoy "losing myself" in a good book or in imagination				
14. I have a good sense of humour				
15. My work is often quite original				
16. I am able to come up with a large number of ideas or solutions to problems				
17. I am able to take charge of planning a project				
18. I don't mind being different from other people				
19. I like to study subjects that are challenging or even difficult				
20. I often use music, art, or drama to express my feelings				
21. I don't like to accept what someone else says without challenging it				
22. I feel strongly about things and often express my feelings, even if I think others will disagree				
23. I spend more time than I would need to on assignments because I enjoy the learning				

A STUDENT LOOKS AT HIMSELF (cont'd.)

24. Here are six areas of talent. In which area do you see yourself as being most talented? Rank them as you see them applying to your abilities. (1) First talent area, (2) Second talent area, etc.

_____ General intellectual ability

_____ Specific academic aptitude (in one subject area, such as science, math, etc.)

_____ Creative Thinking

_____ Leadership Ability

_____ Visual and performing arts

_____ Psychomotor ability (such as mechanical skills or athletic ability).

PARENT INVENTORY

NAME _____ DATE _____ GRADE _____

SCHOOL _____ BIRTHDATE _____

A. What special talents or skills does your child have? _____

_____

Give example of behaviour that illustrates this. _____

_____

_____

B. Check the following items as best describes your child as you see him or her.

	NO	LITTLE	SOME	A GREAT DEAL
1. Is alert beyond his years				
2. Likes School				
3. Has interests of older children or of adults in games and reading				
4. Sticks to a project once it is started				
5. Is observant				
6. Has lots of ideas to share				
7. Has many different ways of solving problems				
8. Is aware of problems others often do not see				
9. Uses unique and unusal ways of solving problems				
10. Wants to know how and why				
11. Likes to pretend				
12. Other children call him/her to initiate play activities				
13. Asks a lot of questions about a variety of subjects				
14. Is not concerned with details				
15. Enjoys and responds to beauty				
16. Is able to plan and organize activities				
17. Has above average coordination, agility and ability in organized games				
18. Often finds and corrects own mistakes				
19. Others seem to enjoy his/her company				
20. Makes up stories and has ideas that are unique				
21. Has a wide range of interests				
22. Gets other children to do what he/she wants				
23. Likes to play organized games and is good at them				
24. Enjoys other people and seeks them out				
. Is able and willing to work with others				
. Sets high standards for self				
27. Chooses difficult problems over simple ones				
28. Is able to laugh at himself (if necessary)				
29. Likes to do many things and participates wholeheartedly				
30. Likes to have his/her ideas known				

PARENT INVENTORY (cont'd)

C. Reading interests (favorite type of books and/or titles of favorite books)

_____

D. Favorite school subject _____

E. General attitude toward school _____

F. Favorite playtime, leisure time activity _____

G. Hobbies and special interests (collections, dancing, making models, swimming, singing, painting, cooking, sewing, drama, etc.) _____

_____

H. What special lessons, training or learning opportunities does your child have outside of school _____

_____

I. What are some of the influences at home or at school that may negatively influence your child's performance in school _____

_____

J. What other things would you like us to know that would assist us in planning a program for your child _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

CAMROSE SCHOOL DISTRICT #1315

RE: INDIVIDUAL INTELLECTUAL ASSESSMENT AND
GIFTED & TALENTED PLACEMENT CONSENT FORM

One of the criteria for placement into the Gifted & Talented Program is results on an individual intelligence test. I request your permission to have an intellectual assessment arranged for

_____
Student's Name

Should the candidate qualify, he/she has my permission to attend the Gifted & Talented classes and related activities.

Yours truly,

_____
Teacher or Principal

_____
Parent's Signature

_____
Date